



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The
American Historical Review

THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF HISTORICAL
STUDIES, HELD AT LONDON

THOUGH the gathering which took place in London in April was in some official circulars designated as the Third International Congress of Historical Studies, it is well to remember that it was only the third of the quinquennial, and we may hope and expect regular, series. A modest beginning of such congresses was made at the Hague in 1898, and was followed by a second international gathering at Paris in 1900, held amid the distractions of a great international exposition. If these assemblages were not fully ecumenical, and were only partially successful, this lay in the nature of first beginnings. With the meeting at Rome in 1903 the Congrès International de Sciences Historiques took on the character of a fully-developed and permanent institution. That brilliantly successful gathering was followed by another at Berlin in 1908.¹ Quinquennial recurrence having now been established as the rule, it was on that occasion decided that the next, or fifth, congress should be held at London in 1913. The functions of government in such matters being more limited in Great Britain than in Germany, it was naturally arranged that the British Academy, in co-operation with universities, societies, and other institutions interested in historical science, should undertake the organization of the congress.

An organization thus based would almost of necessity lack some degree of unity and effectiveness. The general committee of organization, nearly a hundred in number, represented some eighty-four different societies and institutions; the executive committee, upon which presumably the actual work fell, was of the excessive number of sixty. It is to be expected that British individualism, which has had such brilliant results in history, should have its compensation in an organizing power, for such occasions, inferior to that of some

¹ See Professor Haskins's article in volume XIV. of this journal, pp. 1-8.

other nations. The Berlin committee issued the first of its preliminary circulars fifteen months before the date of the congress, and its programme well in advance of that date. The London committee issued its first circular only seven months beforehand, and its last circular, and the programme, did not reach the hands of the foreign members till after their arrival; no provisional list of members was generally available, and there was nothing answering to the *Kongresstageblatt* which proved so convenient in 1908. But while the course of the congress was marked by some *contretemps* that contrasted with the smooth running of the Berlin assembly, and while it is proper, and may be useful, to mention some of these facts of history, there was not a single foreign member, so far as the observations extended on which the present account is based, in whom the sense of such defects was not quite overborne by appreciation of the abounding hospitality, kindness, and desire to make the occasion agreeable in every way to the visitors. Individuals exerted themselves valiantly to do whatever organization had not already effected, and the atmosphere of solicitude and good-will was unmistakable. The individuals whom most members will remember with the greatest gratitude are, naturally, Professor I. Gollancz, secretary of the congress, Professor J. P. Whitney, secretary for papers, and Dr. George W. Prothero, vice-chairman of the executive committee.

All that is best in British hospitality was displayed in the entertainments which were tendered to members, especially to the foreign members, in lavish profusion. Evenings, from half-past four o'clock on, were happily left free for such pleasures. Two evenings before the formal opening of the sessions the Royal Historical Society gave a handsome dinner in the Venetian Room of the Holborn Restaurant, at which Professor Charles H. Firth, president of the society, presided, and at which responses to his address of welcome were made by Professor Eduard Meyer of Berlin, Professor Henri Cordier of Paris, and another address by the representative of the American Historical Association, Professor Charles H. Haskins of Harvard.

On the evening before the first session, the officers of the congress gave a general reception at the Grafton Galleries, which had been made the general headquarters. On the next evening, the British government, represented by Earl Beauchamp, First Commissioner of works, and Mr. Joseph Pease, President of the Board of Education, gave in the imposing banquetting-hall of the Hotel Cecil a brilliant dinner, to some four hundred of the members, at which speeches in response to toasts were made by Count Alexis

Bobrinskiĭ, Dr. Felix Liebermann, and the Master of Peterhouse (Dr. A. W. Ward), and which was followed by a more general reception. On the succeeding evening, tickets for a splendid performance of *Hamlet* by Forbes Robertson and his company, at the historic Drury Lane Theatre, were placed at the disposal of the guests; on another, tickets to Professor Geddes's *Masque of Learning*; on another, a large number of members were invited to a very agreeable dinner at the Lyceum Club, the most notable women's-club of London. On the Saturday afternoon the members enjoyed the hospitality of King George at Windsor Castle, though the king himself, on account of mourning for his uncle the King of the Hellenes, was unable to be present.

The list of private dinners, and of entertainments and opportunities necessarily confined to a smaller number, but distributed by the committee with great thoughtfulness, would be a still longer one. The Archbishop of Canterbury and Mrs. Davidson gave a reception at Lambeth Palace; the Dean of Westminster entertained at the Abbey. The Dukes of Westminster and Wellington, the Marquis of Lansdowne, and the Earl of Ellesmere, admitted members to an inspection of the art-treasures of Grosvenor House, Apsley House, Lansdowne House, and Bridgewater House. Sir Courtenay Ilbert, clerk to the House of Commons, twice conducted parties through the Houses of Parliament. The Royal Historical Society kept open house. The Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records (Sir Henry Maxwell-Lyte), the Director of the British Museum (Sir Frederick Kenyon), the Constable of the Tower, the Master of the Temple, the Master of the Charterhouse, the Director of the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Vice-Provost of Eton College, made occasions for exhibiting with much hospitality the historic establishments committed to their charge. The Chilean minister (Señor Don Agustin Edwards), Sir George and Lady Trevelyan, Mr. John Murray and others gave receptions; and on the final evening there was a very pleasant subscription dinner at the Great Central Hotel, where representatives of various nationalities embraced the opportunity to express with warmth and enthusiasm their sense of all that had been so generously done to make the congress enjoyable and memorable.

Even with the ending of the congress, however, hospitality did not end. The next day there were visits to Cambridge and Oxford, where a large number of members were entertained to dinner, at Cambridge by the Master of Peterhouse in the hall of that college, at Oxford by the teachers of history and law, in the hall of All Souls. A certain number also took part in an excursion to Bath, to the Cheddar caverns and Glastonbury under the guidance of Pro-

fessor Boyd Dawkins, and to Wells, and were agreeably entertained by the mayor of Bath and by the Bishop and the Dean of Wells.

Let it not be thought that too much has been made of these social pleasures. It is chiefly through them, on such an occasion, that one obtains that increase of acquaintance, that friendship with other members of one's profession, that constitute one of the chief reasons for the existence of international congresses. In a science in which the human element plays so large a part as in history, to meet and talk with, perhaps, several score of those with whom one has corresponded or whose books one has read, is a long help toward the due understanding of what one reads; and if we hope that the diffusion of historical knowledge will be a powerful promoter of international good-will, it is surely of great importance that those in each country who have that diffusion in charge should have and use the means for personal friendship. To have come into personal contact with Doctors Ward and Mahaffy and Cunningham, Cordier and Wilamowitz-Möllendorff and Lamprecht, to name only some of the elder figures, or even to have seen them and heard them talk, is something more than a mere pleasure. More of that pleasure and profit might have been had if there had been easier means of finding members, inevitably much scattered through a great city, or if it had not been for the English "custom" of not introducing, but they were had in a very rewarding measure.

It is understood that about eleven hundred members were registered. As to the representation of the various nationalities, one's only guide at the present time is the early provisional list existing in proof and embracing 680 names. Of these, 450, two-thirds, are British. Something like 65 are German, 30 from Russia (but including a number of Poles), 25 from Austria-Hungary, and only 22 from France, hardly more than from the Netherlands and Belgium together, and not twice as many as from Scandinavia. Twenty persons are known to have been present from the United States—more than might have been expected in April.

The formal sessions of the congress began on the morning of Thursday, April 3, and continued through Tuesday, April 8, ending with a session for the transaction of business, on the following morning. The opening session took place in the Great Hall of Lincoln's Inn, a noble and historic hall. Here the permanent organization was effected. Mr. James Bryce had been designated as president, but his duties as British ambassador in Washington could not be concluded in time to enable him to be present, and, though he was formally made president, the Master of Peterhouse, Dr. A. W. Ward, was chosen to act in his place as presiding officer. The

long list of vice-presidents, usual on such occasions in Europe, was duly passed, and the organization of sections was provided for. After graceful introductory words, Dr. Ward read the presidential address which Mr. Bryce, with a message of regret for his absence, had sent across the Atlantic.

Mr. Bryce took up first the appropriate topic of the expansion of range which in the last two generations the study of history has undergone. Among the causes of this expansion he dwelt especially upon the opening up of three new fields of investigation, which have not only provided new materials for our study, but have incidentally affected our view of the way in which the old materials ought to be handled. For one, the study of primitive man has given us data which extend the history of mankind from the bronze age back to neolithic times, and from them back into one palaeolithic age after another, and thus through a period each division of which is longer than all the time that has elapsed since our first historical records begin. In the second place, the last sixty years, with their excavations in Egypt, in western Asia, and in the lands about the Aegæan, have added to our knowledge of early Mediterranean civilizations more than did all the centuries that had passed since the days of Macedonian and Roman conquest and thus have given a new aspect and background to the classical history of Greece and Rome. Thirdly, the progress of modern geographical discovery, and of conquest and settlement, by bringing within our ken the habits and manners, the religious ideas and rudimentary political institutions, of a large number of backward races and tribes scattered over the earth, has given us a fuller and more lively idea both of primeval savagery and of the state of those more advanced barbarian tribes whom the ancient authorities describe as they found them lying outside the bounds of the classical world.

Next, speaking from the vantage-ground of his observations as an assiduous traveller, Mr. Bryce adverted to the ethnical changes that are going on in the present-day world outside of Europe—the weaker or more backward races changing or vanishing under the impact of civilized man, their languages disappearing, their religious beliefs withering, their tribal organizations dissolving, their customs fading slowly away, first from use and then from memory—and urged upon historians the duty of seizing betimes these vanishing phenomena, and extracting from them whatever light they can cast upon such obscure historical processes as those by which races have been differentiated from one another, or those by which tribal communities have been formed, or have coalesced into nations.

Finally, the president of the congress—chosen to that position,

we may assume, as best representing the cosmopolitan spirit in the historical thinking of England—drew the attention of his hearers to the rapid process by which the modern world is becoming one. A few languages, a few religions, a few great powers, are taking the place once occupied by manifold diversity. Movements of politics, of economics and finance, and of thought, in each region of the world, become more closely interwoven with those of every other. History tends to become the history of mankind as a whole, and the historian will have increasing need of amplitude of conception and power of combination. Meanwhile the students of history, led by their studies to look further back and more widely around than most of their fellow-citizens can do, and knowing better than most men how great is the debt each nation owes to the other, how essential to the advancement of each is the greatness and the welfare of the others and the common friendship of all, are under especial obligation to become a bond of sympathy between peoples, to reduce every source of international ill-feeling, and to point the way to peace and good-will throughout the world.

The acting president followed with supplementary remarks, chiefly devoted to a review of the improvements made during the last half-century in respect of aids to historical progress—the opening and exploitation of archives, the institution of historical publishing commissions and societies, the growth of historical instruction in universities and schools, the increase of reference-works and of journals.² On behalf of the delegates to the congress, Professor von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff of the Prussian Academy made with his accustomed felicity and eloquence a brief address appreciative of the words of welcome, and was followed by M. Henri Cordier of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres and by Mr. Charles Francis Adams of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Sir George Trevelyan, in a happy speech, moved the vote of thanks to the president and acting-president and the proposal confirming their election, and was supported by the Greek minister (M. Jean Gennadios) and the minister of Chile.

Of general sessions for the reading of papers there were two, the first held in the same stately hall of Lincoln's Inn, the second in one of the large halls of the University of London at South Kensington. In the first, the veteran Professor Ernst Bernheim of Greifswald, whose pupil through his *Lehrbuch* we all are, read a closely reasoned paper on "Die Interpretation aus den Zeitan-
schau-

² A pamphlet printed by the Oxford University Press contains Mr. Bryce's presidential address and the introductory and supplementary remarks of Dr. Ward.

ungen". Professor Henri Pirenne of Ghent, in an oral discourse which we hope to be able at a later time to present to our readers in written form, discussed the social stages of the evolution of capitalism from the twelfth century to the nineteenth, but especially those of the medieval period, controverting Sombart, and setting forth brilliantly, with the aid of Flemish and other examples, his views of the origin of medieval cities in northern Europe and of the growth of capitalism in them. An allied topic was later treated by him in a paper read before one of the sections of the congress, on the relations of *grand commerce* to medieval urban economy, in which he urged that current views of medieval *Stadt-wirtschaft* had been based too largely on the study of the craft-gild period, too little on considerations derived from the preceding period of capitalistic commerce. In the general session his address was followed by one, of much vigor and breadth of view, in which Professor Otto von Gierke of Berlin discussed the historical development, chiefly in Germany, of the principle of control by majority of votes, which he traced from the conception of unanimity as requisite, through the fellowship-conception (*Genossenschaftsbegriff*) to the corporation-conception, formulated by legists and canonists, to the doctrines based on the theory of the social contract, and to the present time, exhibiting the principle as one of only historical and relative value.

In this same general session Mr. R. J. Whitwell of Oxford submitted proposals for a new dictionary of medieval Latin, a task which would be in an appalling degree an *œuvre de longue haleine*; at a later session it was appropriately relegated to the British Academy for consideration, but it could not be hopefully undertaken with resources less formidable than those of the International Union of Academies.

In the second general session of the congress Professor Eduard Meyer of Berlin gave a conversational account of the work of the past generation in research in ancient history. Professor Lappo-Danilevski of the St. Petersburg Academy read a valuable paper on the evolution of the idea of the state in Russia in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, beginning with the religious idea of the state laid down by the Orthodox church in the times before the czar Alexis, and tracing its gradual secularization, through the influence of Renaissance and Reformation and the later doctrines of natural law, and through the infiltration of the views of Grotius, Hobbes, Puffendorf, and other Occidental publicists, down to Peter the Great and the constitutional projects of 1730. Professor Lamprecht of Leipzig followed with a survey of the recent currents of intellectual development in Germany, and Professor Jorga of Bucharest

with an argument, not universally convincing, that the history of the Middle Ages, heretofore related from a false point of view, needed to be remade in the light of generalizations which he deemed both novel and conclusive.

But, as on former occasions, it had been found necessary, in justice to all the various interests involved, to divide the congress into sections, each organized with its presiding officer, vice-presidents, and secretary; and, apart from the papers which have been described, most of its operations went on in sectional meetings. While the arrangement of the sections followed in general the model of the Berlin congress, there were some characteristic variations. The chief of these lay in the increase of the number of sections from eight to nine by substituting, for the one section which at Berlin had embraced the whole of the political history of both medieval and modern times, two sections, one occupied with medieval history, the other with modern. Colonial history, to which it was natural to pay much attention in an historical congress held in the capital of the British empire, and military and naval history, were attached to the latter, but as sub-sections. There were some other instances of organized sub-sections. The general scheme of sections was the following: I. Oriental history, including Egyptology; II. Greek and Roman history, and Byzantine history; III. Medieval history; IV. Modern history, including the history of colonies and dependencies and naval and military history; V. Religious and ecclesiastical history; VI. Legal and economic history (two autonomous sub-sections, which might well on future occasions be made separate sections); VII. History of medieval and modern civilization; VIII. Archaeology, with prehistoric studies and ancient art (the Berlin scheme had provided a section for *Kunstgeschichte* in general); IX. Related and auxiliary sciences. Perhaps it was only the sub-section for military and naval history whose programme can be said to have been organized with a view to promoting a specific practical result. Here a definite purpose was manifest to bring about, on the part of the British naval and military services, a more scientific study of the history of warfare, to bring historians and officers into closer relations and into co-operation, and to encourage, in the history of each war, the habit of combining the study of land and sea operations in one view. It should also be mentioned that two entire sessions of section VIII. were devoted to Russian subjects, making an impressive exhibition of the recent advances and results of archaeological exploration in southern Russia. In the other sections the programmes were made up, as committees on such occasions usually

have to make them up, without much approach to unity, of such papers as can be obtained from those who expect to attend.

Speaking of the sessions in general, it may be said that papers which by extraordinary originality and power were destined to alter signally the maps of their respective fields were not numerous; but the general level was high, and the total contribution to the science much more than respectable in quantity. There were no sections, and even few individual sessions of sections, that were not felt by those who attended them to have been profitable and interesting. The attendance in sections and sub-sections seems to have varied from fifteen to sixty members.

Something of significance might perhaps be derived from classification of the topics treated, but they would hardly be a guide as to present national tendencies, for there was a natural proclivity toward themes that might be of interest to an audience prevailingly English. Not only did forty of the British papers (which constituted more than half of the entire programme) relate to British history, but nearly twenty of the others. It was noteworthy that not more than half-a-dozen of the papers bore on diplomatic history, though it was the Société d'Histoire Diplomatique which brought into existence the first international historical congress and the field is one congenial to such occasions; and that not a sixth of the whole mass of papers related to the old staple field of political history in the conventional sense. An American could not help thinking it to be a strange fact that, of more than a hundred papers presented by British subjects, only one was concerned wholly, and another partially, with the history of the United States, a country embracing nearly two-thirds of the English-speaking population of the globe.

The diversity of languages produced some of the same difficulties it has always produced since the unfortunate experiment of Babel, but of course, in view of the better European instruction in modern languages, much less than would have been experienced in a similar American assemblage. Two-thirds of the papers were read in English, about 35 in French, about 25 in German, two in Italian. These four were the recognized languages of the meeting. The rules of the Berlin congress had permitted the reading of papers in either German, French, English, Italian, or Latin. An interesting episode of the present congress was the presentation to members, in the shape of a pamphlet, in Russian and French, of a formal protest against the exclusion of Russian.³ This document, prepared by Professor N. Bubnov of the University of Kiev, had been ap-

³ *Les Titres Scientifiques de la Langue Russe pour l'Admission de la Langue Russe dans les Congrès Historiques Internationaux* (Kiev, 1913).

proved by the philosophical faculty and the council of his university, and forwarded by them to the congress for its consideration. On the general ground, Professor Bubnov maintained that the only defensible course was to leave each *savant* free to speak in what tongue he might choose; good sense and the desire to be understood would form a sufficient check upon vagaries. Speaking specifically for Russian, he argued with great warmth against the slight put upon it by exclusion, against an assumed doctrine that it was not a "civilized" speech, and, more appropriately, that the work of Russian scholars in Russian history, in Byzantine history, and in the whole history of eastern Europe (to say nothing of what they had done in the economic history of the West) had attained such dimensions and quality that to exclude their language from an international historical congress would bar it from any but a most defective and conventional consideration of that whole great field. At the close of the congress, as will be seen, the question quietly settled itself.

To give, in one article of moderate length, an account of two hundred scientific papers is manifestly impossible. The mere desire to hear any large number of them, a desire natural to anyone not hopelessly specialized, was sufficient to induce feelings of despair; but such is, as we all know, the nature of congresses held in sections. No convenient place had been found in London where under one roof so many as nine (and at times thirteen or fourteen) separate sections of historical folk could hold simultaneous meetings. Six of them could however be contained in rooms adjacent to each other in Burlington House, to wit, in the rooms of the Royal Society, the Society of Antiquaries, the Royal Astronomical Society, and the Chemical, Geological, and Linnean societies. To go from one to another of these sections, if need required, was therefore not difficult; it was harder in the case of sections which met at places so remote or scattered as University College, King's College, the Old Hall of Lincoln's Inn (legal section), or the Royal United Service Institution in Whitehall (colonial, military and naval).

But printed summaries of most of the papers were at hand⁴ (a provision, by the way, which much facilitated genuine discussion, and which should be more largely introduced at the annual meetings of the American Historical Association); and while it is not expected that the executive committee of the congress will be able to do much in the way of publication, doubtless many of the more valuable papers will in one way or another find their way into print. Unless the congress exercises its prior rights, this journal expects to

⁴ A complete set of these summaries is preserved at the office of this journal, and will be placed in various ways at the service of those interested.

have the pleasure of printing, not only the contribution of Professor Pirenne already mentioned, but also those of Professor Dietrich Schäfer of Berlin on the Sound-Dues as a Source of International History, of Mr. Goddard H. Orpen on the Effects of Norman Rule in Ireland, 1169-1333, of Professor Hume Brown of Edinburgh on the Intellectual Influences of Scotland on the Continent in the Eighteenth Century, of Professor Arnold Meyer of Rostock on Charles I. and Rome, of Dr. A. J. Carlyle on the Sources of Medieval Political Theory and its Connection with Medieval Politics, and in some form that of Sir Charles Lucas on Some Historical Problems in the West Indies; perhaps also others.⁵

Of contributions not already named, one may perhaps mention, as especially notable: in section I., the discourses of Professors A. A. Macdonell of Oxford and C. F. Lehmann-Haupt of Liverpool, on the Early History of Caste and on the Historical Position of Armenia in Ancient Times, respectively; in section II., Professor Otto Seeck on "Die letzte Waffengang des Römischen Heidentums"; in section III., the papers of Professors N. Bubnov and R. Davidsohn, the former on the legend of Gerbert, Pope Silvester II., the latter on the "spring-time of Florentine culture"; in the legal sub-section, Sir Frederick Pollock on the Transformation of Equity and Professor Esmein of Paris on the maxim "Princeps legibus solutus est" in old French law; and in the economic sub-section, Professor Charles M. Andrews's paper, which won warm commendations, on Anglo-French Commercial Rivalry, 1700-1750.

American readers may be interested to know what were the American contributions to this varied banquet. In addition to the papers of Professor Andrews and Dr. Hazeltine, named above and below, they were as follows: the Government of Normandy under Henry II., by Professor Haskins; the Orgy of Tiberius at Capri, by Mr. T. Spencer Jerome of that island; the Relation of the United States to the Philippine Islands, by Professor Bernard Moses of the University of California, formerly a member of the governing commission of that dependency;⁶ Contemporaneous European Action on the Monroe Declaration, by Mr. Dexter Perkins; Historiometry, a

⁵ Other papers known to be on their way to publication are, those of Professor Eduard Meyer on the Representation of Foreign Races on the Egyptian Monuments (Prussian Academy), of Mr. H. W. C. Davis on Canon Law and the Church of England (*Church Quarterly Review*), of Dr. Harold D. Hazeltine on the Early History of English Equity, of Dr. Felix Liebermann on the National Assembly in the Anglo-Saxon State, of Professor Alexander Cartellieri on "Philipp August und der Zusammenbruch des Angevinischen Reiches"; and a selection, in one volume, from the papers of section IV.

⁶ See the *Atlantic Monthly* for May, 1913.

New Method in the Science of History, by Dr. F. A. Woods; and Typical Steps of American Expansion, by J. F. Jameson.

The conviction has not been concealed, in this brief account, that the act and fact of meeting were of more importance than the scientific content of the papers, many of which would in any case have been produced; yet the scientific product was both extensive and valuable. In definite achievements by framing or promoting important international undertakings, these international historical congresses have hitherto borne no considerable fruit, have indeed accomplished much less than, with a more truly international permanent organization, they might easily have done. In the business session with which this present congress was concluded, little more was transacted than the selection of the next place of meeting. Official invitations had been received from St. Petersburg and from Athens. In view of its priority and of the number of Russians present to support it, it was natural that the former should be accepted. The international historical congress of 1918 will therefore take place at St. Petersburg. The vote to that effect was accompanied with a resolution, somewhat gratuitous as it appeared to the transatlantic observer, instructing the executive committee to consider the question of adding Russian to the list of languages permitted for papers and discussions. It is not conceivable that an international historical congress should be held in St. Petersburg without the fullest freedom in the use of the Russian language, and those who think of attending, and wish to derive full profit from doing so, may as well address themselves at once, with such courage as they can muster, to the painful assault upon that formidable tongue.

It was natural for those Americans who have attended this or previous international historical congresses, and has had their shares of what Rome or Berlin or London have done in promoting the success of those gatherings, to wish that it might soon be the good fortune of the United States to entertain one. Doubtless the journey would seem difficult to many historians, and after going to St. Petersburg in 1918 it may be natural to wish to assemble in 1923 in some capital more central to western Europe, and the summer climate of Washington, or any other American city, would seem too hot to even the most philosophical of European historians; but if the spring vacations of European universities continue to be as ample in 1928 as now, we may well cherish the hope of entertaining that spring in our own capital the eighth international congress of historical science.

In the way of preparation for the future, the present meeting

went no farther than to appoint a small British executive committee, to act till a special committee of organization for the new congress should be brought into existence. The executive committee which had been in function during the six days of the congress had been fortified by a certain number of non-British members from the various sections. It is to be hoped, in the interest of proper future development and usefulness of the congress as an institution, as well as in the more immediate interest of catholic judgments on matters concerning the next congress in particular, that in its preliminary organization means may be taken toward creating at least a relatively permanent advisory committee of representatives of various nations, which on each quinquennial occasion may act with the national body entrusted with the immediate proceedings. Such a step, toward which indeed some suggestion was made by the expiring committee, would aid to give continuity of regulations and policy, and might ultimately make the congress a potent means, not merely as now of international friendship but of international achievement.

It was announced that, if more could not be done in the way of publication, at least a volume would be brought out containing the addresses of the president and acting president of this London congress, a general record of its organization and proceedings, and the summaries already mentioned as having been distributed in connection with the reading of the papers.⁷ Then the congress dissolved, with many formal and informal words of appreciation for the labor, the thoughtfulness, and the hospitality which had been expended in making it so distinguished a success. None, it is certain, were more cordial in the feeling of gratitude than the Americans, to whom English welcome had been especially abundant, and for whom London and England have stronger associations and richer sources of feeling than they can have for nations who do not owe to England their existence.

J. F. J.

⁷ Also, the British Academy will be requested to publish in its proceedings such papers as were presented by fellows or corresponding members of that body. On the papers in modern history, see also note 5, above.